




Docket No.: 240732US3X

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313



RE: Application Serial No.: 10/625,657
Applicants: Saburou WAKITA, et al.
Filing Date: July 24, 2003
For: CASTING APPARATUS AND
METHOD THEREFOR
Group Art Unit: 1725
Examiner: TRAN, L.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

GREGORY J. MAIER
(703) 413-3000
GMAIER@OBLON.COM

CHRISTOPHER D. WARD
SENIOR ASSOCIATE
(703) 413-3000
CWARD@OBLON.COM

SIR:

Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Our check in the amount of 0.00 is attached covering any required fees. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Gregory J. Maier

Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number

22850

(703) 413-3000 (phone)
(703) 413-2220 (fax)

Christopher D. Ward
Registration No. 41,367

240732US3X



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF :
Saburou WAKITA, et al. : EXAMINER: TRAN, L.
SERIAL NO: 10/625,657 :
FILED: July 24, 2003 : GROUP ART UNIT: 1725
FOR: CASTING APPARATUS :
AND METHOD
THEREFOR

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the Restriction Requirement dated June 15, 2004, the Applicants elect with traverse the invention of Group I corresponding to Claims 1-4.

The Applicants respectfully traverse the restriction requirement based on MPEP § 803, which states:

... If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.

The claims of the present invention would appear to be part of an overlapping search area.


Application Serial No.: 10/625,657
Reply to Restriction Requirement dated June 15, 2004

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully traverse the outstanding restriction requirement on the grounds that a search and examination of the entire application would not place a *serious* burden on the Examiner.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the requirement to elect a single invention be withdrawn, and that a full examination on the merits of Claims 1-5 be conducted.

Respectfully Submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Registration No. 25,599
Attorney of Record

Christopher D. Ward
Registration No. 41,367

Customer Number

22850

Tel. (703) 413-3000
Fax. (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 10/01)

GJM:CDW:brf

I:\atty\cdw\CDW\Election of Species.doc